



COVER SHEET

This is the author-version of a paper first published as:

Flack, Ted and Ryan, Christine (2005) Financial Reporting by Australian Nonprofit Organisations: Dilemmas Posed by Government Funders . *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 64(3):pp. 69-77.

Copyright 2005 Blackwell Publishing.

Accessed from: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00003593/>

The definitive version is available at www.blackwell-synergy.com

**Financial Reporting by Australian Nonprofit Organisations:
Dilemmas Posed by Government Funders**

Ted Flack
Centre of Philanthropy and Nonprofit Studies
Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane Queensland
t.flack@qut.edu.au
Phone: + 61 7 3864 4313

Christine Ryan
School of Accountancy
Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane Queensland
cm.ryan@qut.edu.au
Phone: +61 7 3864 2881

Please address all correspondence to:

Ted Flack
t.flack@qut.edu.au
Phone: + 61 7 3864 4313

Financial Reporting by Australian Nonprofit Organisations: Dilemmas Posed by Government Funders

ABSTRACT

Nonprofit organisations comprise a growing and important sector of the Australian economy. Moreover, this sector is being used by governments to an increasing extent for the delivery of services. The most common manner in which nonprofit organisations are funded by government departments is through the provision of grants, contracts or service agreements. Nonprofits discharge their accountability for these funds through reporting guidelines issued by the government funders. This paper examines the financial accountability requirements of government funders, in one jurisdiction in Australia to support the central argument in the paper that the emphasis on 'upward and external' accountabilities serve as a functional and control tool on the sector. This emphasis detracts from the development of the 'downward and internal' mechanisms of accountability which are the essential building blocks for the strategic development of the capacity of the sector to respond to calls for greater accountability. The paper will be of interest to government funders, nonprofit practitioners and accounting standard setters, auditor practitioners and regulators.

1.0 Introduction

Governments at Federal, State and local levels in Australia are important sources of the financial resources of nonprofit organisations. Australian governments contributed \$10.1 billion or 31.3% of the total revenue of nonprofit organisations in 2000-01, compared to the \$2.9 billion contributed by household donations and membership dues, and \$.4 billion provided by corporate donations (ABS 2002). These financial resources are provided by governments to nonprofit organisations, on the one hand, to fund services and facilities that further the objectives of governments and, on the other, to further the missions of the funded nonprofit organisations (Auditor General of Western Australia, 2000; Brown and Ryan, 2003). In an age where governments are placing an increasing reliance on the nonprofit sector to deliver many core public services, it is vital that the sector develops the internal mechanisms, capabilities and capacities which allow it to measure its own performance and also to demonstrate that performance and accountability to the Australian community. This, in turn allows nonprofit organisations to fully participate in the development of social capital. Data that truly measures performance, allows comparability, and builds capacity in the sector is essential.

In Australia, when receiving funds to deliver funded services, nonprofit organisations typically enter into a contract or service agreement with the funding government department which specifies both the measures of the services to be delivered and the system of financial accountability required. There is anecdotal evidence of multiple and irreconcilable differences in the reporting requirements of government funding programs, the imposition of significant compliance costs on these nonprofit organisations and the submission of incomparable (and therefore less useful) data for the government. The aim of this paper is to examine the entire set of funding agreements between government and nonprofit organisations in one jurisdiction in Australia to obtain detailed empirical evidence on the financial accountability information requirements of government funders. This study will provide evidence to what are essentially theoretical arguments on the impact that funders have on shaping the accountability of nonprofit organisations and will also provide evidence on any inconsistencies in reporting requirements. The research will be of interest to government regulators when assessing reporting requirements, to the nonprofit peak bodies and to Australian accounting standard setters as they consider harmonisation with international accounting standards. The paper proceeds as follows; the next section examines the specific theme of the paper, that of accountability, the section following draws data from the funding requirements of government departments to amplify the accountability issues. Policy implications are then drawn from the study.

2.0 Accountability Perspectives and Mechanisms

Traditional approaches to accountability examine the issue from the perspective of who is accountable, to whom are they accountable and for what they are accountable. Broadbent and Laughlin (2003) when discussing the relationship between 'who' is accountable advance the arguments by distinguishing between the *authority* granted to a person or an organisation, versus that applying when managers are made accountable for the *responsibilities* delegated to them. They argue that one of the key differences in making this distinction relates to control. The level of control maintained by one who delegates responsibility is greater than when authority is granted to someone. The nature of the relationship between the two parties thus has an important bearing on the accountability mechanisms appropriate in any situation.

Broadbent and Laughlin (2003) tease out these relationships further, by examining different approaches to accountability. In describing the economic approach, using a principal and agent framework, they argue that rather than one linear relationship, there is a continuum of accountability. What differentiates one end of the spectrum from the other is the nature and level of expectations between the principal and agent. At one end of the spectrum, a principal may transfer funds to an agent, and the discharge of accountability is left entirely for the agent to define and acquit. At the other end of the spectrum, the principal directly controls the actions of the agent who has no autonomy. While economic principal/agent theorists have concentrated on understanding the contracts which exist between the principal and agent, much of the accountability literature develops an understanding of accountability relationships by examining those aspects of accountability systems which attempt to ensure the behavioural compliance of the agent. While this analytical tool has been particularly useful in the forprofit sector, the concept of 'trust' plays a more integral part in any discussion of accountability in the nonprofit sector.

Although the notion of 'trust' is not explored in any detail by Broadbent and Laughlin (2003), they do state that sometimes the various mechanisms to ensure behavioural compliance are not needed when there is a high level of trust that the 'agent' will comply with what the 'principal' requires. Indeed economists argue that one of the reasons that nonprofit organisations have continued to prosper in modern mixed economies is that their nonprofit structure (prohibiting the distribution of surpluses or residual assets to controllers of the organisation) allows stakeholders to afford them a greater level of trust than they might be expected to give purely commercial entities (Hansmann, 1987; Weisbrob, 1988). This theme of trust and its relationship to accountability in the nonprofit sector is further elaborated on by Ebrahim (2003). He examines five mechanisms of accountability (reports and disclosure statements; performance assessments; participation; self regulation and social audits) along the dimensions, 'upward'- 'downward accountability', 'internal-external' accountability, and 'functional-strategic'

accountability. He argues that traditional mechanisms of accountability focus on upward, external and functional dimensions, and have a short-term focus. In the past, in response to the demands of the providers of funds, nonprofit organisations have focussed on 'upward' and 'external' accountability to donors, foundations and other providers of funds. Ebrahim (2003) argues that the 'downward', 'internal' and 'strategic' dimensions of accountability remain relatively underdeveloped. These refer to accountability to clients, their supporters, their staff and to the broader communities served by the nonprofit organisation. Nonprofit organisations (like their government funders) are faced with the inherent difficulties associated with the evaluation of nonfinancial performance (Whitaker, Altman-Sauer and Henderson, 2004). For many nonprofit organisations, the capacity to maintain informal and social relationships as a part of internal mission focused and 'client centred' systems of accountability is the attribute that makes nonprofit organisations more trustworthy, more closely in touch with community values and needs and therefore attractive to governments as the means of providing services in the community (Bogart, 1995; Hansmann, 1980; Murray and Tassie, 1994; Seal and Vincent-Jones, 1997). A greater focus on these internal aspects of accountability is likely to enhance the governance and effectiveness of nonprofit organisations (Buckmaster, 1999). However, all these accountability mechanisms are crucial for the survival of nonprofit organisations as they need to manage their relations with a diverse set of stakeholders who not only provide financial resources but also confer legitimacy (Kearns, 1996). Ebrahim argues that for the long term survival of the sector, the focus needs to be shifted from the external dimensions of accountability to internally driven mechanisms which can enhance the legitimacy, reputation and capacity building of the nonprofit sector.

A key tenant in shifting focus and in responding to the increasing calls from a range of stakeholders to be more accountable, is the preparedness of the sector to demonstrate performance on the promises implicit in their mission focus (Reiser, 2004). Ebrahim (2003) argues that in this shift, it is not enough for nonprofits to rely solely on the trust afforded to them. He argues that funders and regulators have a responsibility in this respect to assist the nonprofit sector to build internal capacity and develop long-term assessment tools rather than relying too much on regular financial accountability reports. Thus, what needs to be built into organisations is the capacity to conduct long-term evaluations of their own work and less reliance on the traditional functional monitoring and control mechanisms. If such evaluations are to occur, a mix of financial and non-financial performance data is required.

In this research, we focus on an examination of the financial accountability requirements of a set of government funders in one Australian jurisdiction provides a 'window of opportunity' to examine the specific requirements of this powerful group of stakeholders. The prime building

block of comparable financial data is a consistent categorisation and commonly accepted terminology of key concepts underpinning the data. Without this crucial building block, compliance costs increase, comparability of data is impossible, and the sector is locked into discharging external/upwards accountability at the expense of internal/downwards accountability and self-assessment.

In sum, in part, accountability is about being responsible to actors who are external to the organisation for the results of the organisation. Functional mechanisms such as reports, and financial details play an important role in monitoring and controlling a nonprofit organisation's activities. However, the other aspect of accountability is the internal capacity building within an organisation which contributes to the longer-term self evaluative framework and ensures capacity building at the sector level and contributes to the more complex issue of the nonprofit sectors' role in the issues of social and political change.

3.0 Method

The aim of the research was to interrogate the funding agreements of state government departments as a 'window' into the financial reporting requirements placed by these funding departments on nonprofit organisations. All 24 Queensland state government departments that administer contracts or service agreements with nonprofit organisations were contacted and asked to provide copies of their financial accountability requirements under all programs. Since some Departments administer several different programs that involve funding agreements with nonprofit organisations, the letter asked Departments to provide details for each of the programs they administer. The letter was endorsed by the Queensland Treasury Department on behalf of the project team.

One of the problems with the collection of data was that the detailed financial reporting instructions and associated forms were not contained in a single document. Because the details sought were in some cases contained in several documents, four types of source documents were obtained from the funding departments: application for funding forms, periodic financial report formats, related explanatory documents, and those sections of funding agreements issued to funded nonprofit organisations that related to financial reporting.

Of the 24 Queensland government departments, two departments did not have any special financial reporting requirements of the funded nonprofit organisations. One of these departments required funded organisations to submit a 'profit and loss report for each quarter', together with the organisation's 'audited annual financial reports', whilst the other required a

'general ledger listing' for all financial transactions for each quarter. The requirements of these two departments were not considered in our detailed analysis because they did not impose special reporting requirements on the nonprofit sector. In terms of our analysis, it is argued that they have moved beyond external accountability to relying on some trust in the accounts produced the nonprofit organisations.

The full range of documents of the remaining 22 departments were interrogated ¹ The agencies included in the survey are listed in Appendix 1.

4.0 Findings and Policy implications

Our detailed analysis revealed two major categories of findings. First, findings in relation to whole-of-government reporting, and second findings in relation to specific reporting requirements.

From a whole-of-government perspective, the 22 government departments were involved in funding 31 different programs, and most programs had different sets of acquittal documents. In other words, from the perspective of an individual government department, the one department had a different set of forms and different definitions for the items to be collected under different programs. So, not only was there no consistency across government agencies, in most government departments there was little consistency within that particular government department. The impact of this becomes apparent if we take the case of one nonprofit organisation. As an example (and not an unusual one), one youth and family service organisation in Queensland, receives \$4m in grants from Commonwealth, State and local governments. They report back on 37 separate grants – and the need to run a separate excel spreadsheet alongside their main accounting information system. The lack of standardisation within one level of government, let alone across levels of government means that the

¹ The original documents returned by each department varied considerably in content and format. In order to obtain some overall picture of the requirements, each document was coded for the department and program to which it belonged and each page was numbered to create a comprehensive index to all documents. A Microsoft Excel spreadsheet was then created with a column for each department. Each page of the indexed documents was examined for line descriptions of revenue, expenses, assets and liabilities and as each new item was located, its exact wording was added on a new row and the document reference was recorded in the column corresponding with the department that issued the document. Wherever instructions or explanations that contained any elaboration on financial requirements were contained in the documents, these were noted in Excel 'comments' in the relevant cells. Items that were clearly alternative wordings for similar items were grouped together until all lines of account appearing in all documents were recorded in a 'master chart of accounts'.

information being generated to government is of dubious quality and the compliance costs to the nonprofit organisation are larger than necessary. This lack of reliable base data, in turn, hampers the development of any realistic efforts to develop performance measures on the other more relevant dimensions of accountability.

In relation to specific reporting requirements, our detailed analysis revealed that there were four major areas which presented problems: a range of incompatible financial reporting requirements across departments; dilemmas in the treatment of revenue; a clear preference by departments for a 'fund accounting' framework; and a ubiquitous requirement for the valuation of contributions in kind. Each of these findings will be discussed in turn.

Incompatible Line Descriptions and Aggregations

A total of 129 different revenue item descriptions and 836 different expense item descriptions were identified in the departments' forms or instruction documents. Differences occurred both in the line descriptions and the accounting treatment for the same types of expenses. The major variation occurred around the expense item for labour costs. Our examination revealed a total of 113 different line descriptions in the documents that related to direct labour costs. For example, in the expenses category, departments included different items: for some, 'salaries' covered salaries only; for others, it included salaries and direct on-costs; whilst for others, 'wages and salaries' included items that were treated as 'costs of employment', such as 'staff training' and 'protective clothing'. In some cases, labour costs included staff transport; and some departments required workers compensation insurance to be treated as a salary and wages on-cost, while other departments aggregated this with general insurance.

The cost of compliance implications for funded nonprofit organisations of this variation in terminology and treatment are quite profound. Since a nonprofit organisation's accounting system is designed to capture financial transactions just once, an imposed requirement to report similar transactions in incompatible ways, means that nonprofit organisations that receive funding under agreements that have incompatible acquittal arrangements may have to manually recalculate financial transactions from the vouchers, adding significantly to the costs of compliance for the nonprofit.

The variation in terminology lends empirical weight to the claim by Ebrahim (2003) that external, fiduciary accountability is the focus of the reporting requirements of this group of government funding departments. The other implication that can be drawn from the use of such a wide variety of categorisation and terminology, is that such data could not usefully be aggregated.

Since evaluations of performance rely to some extent on comparisons between the activities being evaluated (Suchman, 1967; Industry Commission, 1995; Productivity Commission, 2004) it would appear that with such variations, government departments are unable to use this financial information to develop comparable data on financial performance or to build efficiency benchmarks of similar activities by different nonprofit organisations. The data appears only to be useful in determining whether the funds have been spent in accordance with the terms of a specific funding agreement, that is, for fiduciary stewardship. With government departments being a substantial provider of funds to the nonprofit sector and their increasing reliance on the sector to deliver services, a move to collecting comparable data would greatly facilitate the provision of feedback to the sector to increase their capacity to evaluate performance and hence their ability to respond to the call for them to be more accountable.

Inconsistency in the Treatment of Revenue Received in Advance

A second finding from the interrogation of the data concerned the dilemma surrounding the treatment of revenue. This is particularly evident in relation to the treatment of unspent funds at the end of the financial year. Some departments required that unspent government funds were to be treated as liabilities, whilst others instructed that unspent funds were to be treated as surplus (asset) but that such surpluses would be carried forward to the new reporting period and used to offset funded program expenses in the new reporting period. The current procedure in Australia for the treatment of unspent funds is clear. The Urgent Issues Group (UIG) in Australia has considered the treatment of accounting for the contributions of non-current assets in its Abstract 11 issued in December 1996 (AASB, 2000). The UIG position is that revenue is recognised when control is obtained over it, and that in the case of any restrictions on revenue, these only be recognised as a liability when there is a present obligation to repay a contribution (par 9). It follows from the UIG Abstract, that in the majority of cases for external reporting for nonprofit agencies in Australia no details need to be given on restrictions placed on funds as there will be no immediate liability.

On one level the requirements placed by government funders is an illustration of variations from accepted accounting practice, and it could be argued that this reinforces the conclusion that the government funders are not aiming to build internal capacity and trust in the sector, but merely advocating prescriptive compliance. At a more macro level, it is acknowledged that there is considerable debate amongst international accounting standard setters about the accounting treatment for revenue received in advance for specific (restricted) purposes. However, the approach in Queensland is to be contrasted to the approach which has been adopted in the

US², UK and Zealand³, where, the problem surrounding unspent grants has been identified, and a consistent approach adopted.

While it is not the aim of this article to debate different accounting treatments, from the nonprofit practitioners' perspective, the inconsistent treatment across government agencies, the conflict between accounting standards, and the imposed requirements for special purpose financial reporting to government funding agencies, increases compliance costs for nonprofit organisations. This, again, casts doubt on the validity of the data being obtained by government and its use or indeed its relevance in any public policy decision making process.

Preference for 'Fund Accounting'

A third finding concerned the 'orientation' of accounts, in other words, whether the accounts are prepared on a 'whole of entity' basis or on a 'fund accounting' basis.⁴ Australian accounting standard setters have moved away from an acceptance of a fund accounting orientation towards a 'whole of entity' basis for the preparation of financial reports (see Australian Accounting Research Foundation, 1988),

However, there is ample evidence that government departments continue to use a fund accounting framework in their requirements in relation to nonprofit organisations. Of the 22 departments included in the study, 18 specified that separate bank accounts must be established for the conduct of the funded activity, whilst a further two departments stated that

² In the US, the Financial Accounting Standards Board has issued 'Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 116: Accounting for Contributions Received and Contributions Made' (FASB, 1993a) and 'Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 117: Financial Statements of Not-for-profit Organizations' (FASB, 1993b). These standards relate to how non-governmental nonprofits account for contributions (Davies, 2003). It needs to be noted that the intent of SFAS 116 and 117 was to enhance the relevance, understand ability and comparability of nonprofits' financial statements. SFAS 117 requires disclosure of contributions with donor-imposed restrictions, into net asset classes separating unrestricted, temporarily restricted, and permanently restricted.

³ Research Bulletin R-120 issued by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of New Zealand (ICANZ1999) entitled 'Financial Reporting by Voluntary Sector Entities' argues that the information on restrictions as to the use of revenues and assets should be provided in the financial statements. The New Zealand situation differs from that in Australia, to the extent that grants or donations subject to genuine conditions should not be recognised as revenue until those conditions are fulfilled. Prior to recognition as revenue, any conditions (restrictions on the use) on revenue mean that the revenue should be accounted for as a refundable advance, i.e. treated as a liability (Par 5.3.1).

⁴ A fund 'is an independent fiscal and accounting entity with a self-balancing set of accounts recording cash and/or other resources together with all related liabilities, obligations, reserves, and equities which are segregated for the purpose of carrying on specific activities or attaining certain objectives in accordance with special regulation, restrictions, or limitations' (Davies, 2003). In other words, in fund accounting money is allocated into separate funds, and financial statements and reports are drawn up by fund, or by grouping funds together.

separate bank accounts would be required unless computerised accounting techniques were available, which would allow the funded nonprofit organisation to keep a separate 'fund' for the funded activity.

Moreover, all 22 departments required nonprofit organisations to apply any *donations received* in support of the funded project or activity to the fund set up to administer the government funding. While it may be argued that this is required because the government department wishes to gain some understanding of the extent of their funding to the total funding for the project, this requirement poses problems for nonprofit organisations. In the first instance, accounting treatment would normally have all donations in one account rather than being apportioned to certain projects. In the second instance, the ubiquitous requirement for donations to be applied to funded projects is likely to cause difficulties for those nonprofit organisations that are endorsed by the Australian Tax Office (Australian Taxation Office, 2000) as 'Deductible Gift Recipients' (DGRs). These organisations are required by the Income Tax Assessment Act 1997 to establish one separate 'gift fund' into which all tax deductible donations are to be placed (Australian Taxation Office, 2003); this rules out accounting for donations for different projects in different 'funds'.

Again, the inconsistency in treatment between the Queensland government funding conditions, the Australian Tax Office and accepted accounting treatment places nonprofit organisations in a dilemma when dealing with these transactions - it places them in jeopardy of breaching either their funding agreements with government funding agencies or breaching tax law. This particular issue again illustrates how difficult it is for nonprofits to deal with their accountability obligations on a day-to-day basis, without any thought of higher levels and objectives of accountability.

Accounting for Contributions in Kind

The final finding concerns the issue of 'the valuation of contributions in kind' from suppliers of goods or services or from volunteers. Fourteen of the 22 departments required that the funded nonprofit organisation report the value of contributions in kind either from the suppliers of goods and services or from volunteers. Only one of the departmental documents provided guidance on how such contributions should be valued, instructing that such contributions should be calculated and reported on the basis of the cost of purchasing the same or similar goods and services in the market.

This requirement has some significant relevance and direct impact for nonprofit organisations. The prevalence of this type of activity, the nature of volunteering and contributions in kind in the nonprofit sector, and the practical difficulties of dollar quantification, are unique to the sector. The prevalence of contributions in kind to the sector is not paralleled in either the forprofit sector or the public sector. Consequently, the development of generally applicable accounting standards for the valuation of contributions in kind, especially in respect of volunteer labour, has been consistently declined by accounting standard setters in most OECD countries.

The implications that flow from this requirement to put a value on contributions in kind are that government-funded nonprofit organisations are faced with further compliance costs. Also, the lack of a common standard once again leads to non-comparable financial data. It could be argued that the information is being collected by government funding departments for acquittal and control purposes rather than performance evaluation.

5.0 Conclusion

The findings of this study confirmed the anecdotal evidence of multiple and irreconcilable differences in the reporting requirements of government funding programs reported by nonprofit accounting practitioners. The data collected supports practitioners' contention that these multiple and incompatible reporting requirements impose significant compliance costs on government funded nonprofit organisations and results in incomparable (and therefore less useful) data for the government. The findings have important policy implications both for governments and for the nonprofit sector, particularly the peak bodies in the sector.

Governments must take a whole-of-government approach to accountability in the nonprofit sector. Governments are increasingly relying on the nonprofit sector to deliver a significant proportion of services that were traditionally seen to be the function of government. The findings of this study confirm the emphasis by government funders in service agreements on mechanisms for 'upward' and 'external' accountability more in line with notions of 'acquittal' or 'receipt giving'. While financial accountability by nonprofit organisations for the funds provided to the sector by government is a critical issue, it is argued that a key performance indicator for governments is the extent to which they can promote, enhance and lay the foundation in improving accountability and performance. It is through their own processes that leadership can be taken. Governments must move from the short-term focus on 'upward and external' accountability mechanisms through using functional funding agreements as instruments of control in the sector, to long-term capacity building through an emphasis on 'downward and internal' mechanisms of accountability for performance in the sector.

The policy implications for the nonprofit sector are equally important. The sector must take the responsibility for demonstrating accountability for its performance. Indeed, the development of this capacity by nonprofit organisations may influence the support of the Australian community—one of the characteristics of nonprofit organisations that make them attractive to governments for service delivery. Nonprofit organisations and their peak bodies must become more active in taking a strategic whole-of-sector approach to identifying situations or mechanisms which are inhibiting the building of long term credibility and capacity in the sector. The current funding arrangements and their accountability mechanisms are one such example.

If the sector is to respond to calls for greater accountability, government funders need to standardise their requirements, so that both governments and nonprofit organisations are able to move to the next stage of a more thorough performance assessment, which is so crucial to the legitimacy and accountability of both the government funders and the nonprofit organisations.

The findings of this research will be of use to accounting standard setters in that the research provides the first clear evidence of the financial information needs of an important group of resource providers to the nonprofit sector. It draws attention to the responses of overseas accounting standard setters to similar nonprofit accounting dilemmas. It also will be of use to government funding departments and to nonprofit accounting practitioners because it identifies areas where there are opportunities to reconcile differences in terminology and to work towards a common approach across departments and programs. Such coordination would help to reduce compliance costs in the nonprofit sector and assist the process of collecting and disseminating comparable data, an important contributor to the larger objective of making performance data more available to inform the accountability debate.

APPENDIX 1

List of Government Departments in Survey

- 1 Arts Queensland
- 2 Department of Corrective Services
- 3 Education Queensland
- 4 Emergency Services, Business Support Services
- 5 Department of Employment and Training
- 6 Environmental Protection Agency (Incorporating Queensland Parks & Wildlife Services)
- 7 Department of Families
- 8 Queensland Health
- 9 Department of Housing – Community Housing
- 10 Department of Industrial Relations
- 11 Department of Innovation and Information Economy, Sport and Recreation Queensland
- 12 Justice and Attorney-General (no grant program)
- 13 Department of Natural Resources and Mines
- 14 Queensland Police Service
- 15 Department of Primary Industries
- 16 Department of Premier and Cabinet
- 17 Sports and Recreation Queensland (See Department of Innovation and Information Economy, Sport and Recreation Queensland above also)
- 18 State Development
- 19 Department of Tourism, Racing and Fair Trading
- 20 Queensland Transport
- 21 Department of Main Roads
- 22 Disability Services Queensland
- 23 Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Policy – Disability Grants
- 24 Department of Local Government and Planning

REFERENCES

- Auditor General of Western Australia. (2000). *A Means to an End: Contracting Not-For-Profit Organisations for the Delivery of Community Services (Performance Evaluation Report 3)*. Perth: Auditor General of Western Australia.
- Australian Accounting Standards Board. (2000). *Urgent Issues Group Abstract 11 - "Accounting for Contributions of, or Contributions for the Acquisition of, Non-Current Assets"*. Melbourne. Australia: Australian Accounting Standards Board.
- Australian Accounting Research Foundation. (1988). *Financial Reporting by Local Governments AAS27*. Caulfield Victoria: Australian Accounting Research Foundation.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). (2002). *Australian National Accounts - Non-Profit Institutions Satellite Account 1999-2000* (cat. no. 5256.0). Belconnen ACT: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- Australian Taxation Office. (2000). *Income Tax Ruling 2000/12: deductible gift recipients*. Australian Taxation Office.
- Australian Taxation Office. (2003). *GiftPack for deductible gift recipients & donors*. Canberra: Australian Taxation Office.
- Bogart, W. T. (1995). *Accountability and Nonprofit Organizations: An Economic Perspective*. Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 6(2), 157-170.
- Broadbent, J. and Laughlin, R. (2003). Control and Legitimation in Government Accountability Processes: The Private Finance Initiative in the UK, *Critical perspectives on Accounting*, Vol. 14, pp. 23-48.
- Brown, K. and Ryan, N. (2003). Redefining Government - Community Relations through Service Agreements. *The Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 9(1), 21-30.
- Buckmaster, N. (1999). *Associations between outcome measurement, accountability and learning for non-profit organisations*. Accountability Auditing & Accountability Journal, 12(2), 186-197.
- Davies, C. (2003). 'The Impact of SFAS 116 and 117 on Nonprofit Organizations', www.mip.com, downloaded 5 August 2003.
- Ebrahim, Alnoor. (2003). Accountability in Practice: Mechanisms for NGOs. *World Development*, 31(5), 813-829.
- Financial Accounting Standards Board (US). (1993a). *Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 116: Accounting for Contributions Received and Contributions Made*. Norwalk: Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB).
- Financial Accounting Standards Board (US). (1993b). *Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 117: Financial Statements of Not-for-profit Organizations*. Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB).
- Hansmann, H. (1980). *The Role of Nonprofit Enterprise*. Yale Law Journal, 89, 835-901.
- Hansmann, H. (1987). *Economic Theories of the Nonprofit Organisation*, : Yale University Press.
- Industry Commission. (1995). *Charitable Organisations in Australia*. Canberra: Commonwealth Information Service.
- Institute of Chartered Accountants of New Zealand. (1999). *Financial reporting by voluntary sector entities*. Wellington, NZ: Institute of Chartered Accountants of New Zealand.
- Kearns, K. (1996). *Managing for Accountability - Preserving the Public Trust in Public and Nonprofit Organisations* (First ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Murray, V. and Tassie, B. (1994). Evaluating *the Effectiveness of Nonprofit Organizations*. In Robert D Herman and Associates (Ed.), *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and Management* (pp. 303-324). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Productivity Commission, 2004, Steering Committee for the Review of Government Service Provision. (2004). *Review of Government Service Provision 2004*. Melbourne: Productivity Commission.

- Reiser, D. B. (2004). *Enron.org: Why Sarbanes-Oxley Will Not Ensure Comprehensive Nonprofit Accountability*. University of California Davis Law Review, 38(205), 1-64.
- Seal, W. and Vincent-Jones, P. (1997). *Accounting and trust in the enabling of long-term relations*. Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 10(3), 406-431.
- Suchman, E. A. (1967). *Evaluative Research: Principles and Practice in Public Service & Social Action Programs*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Weisbrod, B. (1988). *The Nonprofit Economy*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Whitaker, G. P., Altman-Sauer, L. and Henderson, M. (2004). *Mutual Accountability Between Governments and Nonprofits: Beyond "Surveillance" to "Service"*. American Review of Public Administration, 34(2), 115-133.